DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 807 CG 007 374

AUTHOR Christensen, Val R.
TITLE Design and Significance of Student Codes of Conduct.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 25p.; Speech given at APGA Convention, March 25-30, 1972, Chicago, Illinois

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior; *College Students; *Conduct; Misbehavior; *Student Adjustment; *Student Personnel Services

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to conduct a survey of existing student codes of conduct found in university student handbooks for answers to these questions: (1) What are the stated purposes and values of student conduct codes? (2) What are the rationale that universities use to justify policies regarding the non-academic lives of students? (3) How are codes developed and revised? (4) What trends can be seen in code development? (5) Which student handbooks have particular policies dealing with nineteen specific colleges and universities. Each code was evaluated according to nineteen variables. An effort was made to outline the philosophic rationale used to justify codes, to determine methods used to establish and revise the codes, to state values and purposes, and to list trends. Conclusions were drawn on the basis of the findings. (WS)

ED 065807

DESIGN AND SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDENT CODES OF CONDUCT

Dr. Val R. Christensen

A P G A Convention, 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Introduction

In September of 1964, the administration of the University of California at Berkeley issued a series of directives which set in motion a chain of events that eventually lead to a mass student protest in December of the same year. The sit-in was in protest over the University's refusal to allow student use of a small square of cement near Sather Gate, the main entrance to the campus. According to the University directive, students would no longer be allowed to use the sidewalk in front of the campus to distribute pamphlets, give speechs in support of off-campus political and social action, and raise funds and recruit members. Before the protest was over, the free-speech movement turned the attention of all California to its oldest and largest state university. But, perhaps more important, the protest probably was the first significant event in the present world-wide student unrest.

Colleges and universities had asserted for many years that they could not sanction certain student conduct. Most of these rules found their way into a regulation booklet which covered everything from drug abuse to the hours of a day a clothes dryer could be turned on in the dorm. These rules were adequate enough to regulate student behavior in the calm atmosphere of the past; but since "Berkeley," most universities have been advised to review carefully their regulations, especially in areas that are currently termed "political" in nature.

CG 007 374

In a recent survey conducted by the American Council on Education,[1] it was reported that major institutional changes resulting from protest movements occurred on 75 percent of the campuses experiencing violent protests, and on 59 percent of the campuses that underwent disruptive protests. Sixty-two percent of the campuses that experienced no major incidents during the year initiated major changes in campus regulations.

From their earliest beginnings, colleges and universities have been involved in the moral supervision of their students; and many of the rules and regulations used to control student life in earlier years would not be tolerated today. Brubacher and Rudy,[2] in there excellent book, Higher Education In Transition, said that American college "government" in early beginnings of American higher education meant rigorous control of student conduct both in and out of the classroom. They indicate that "The atmosphere resembled that of a low-grade boys' boarding school straight out of the pages of Dickinson. It was adapted more to restless and unruly boys than to responsible young college men, and, indeed, most of the students of this time resemble the former far more than they did the latter." Lee[3] lists in his book the Massachusetts Laws of 1656 which spelled out the legal limits within which Harvard could administer her corporal punishment:

> It is hereby ordered that the President and Fellows are empowered, according to their best discretion, to punish all misdemeanors of the youth in their society either by fine, or whipping in the Hall openly, as the nature of the offences shall require, not exceeding ten shillings or ten stripes for one offense; and this law to continue in force until this Court or the Overseers of the College provide some other order to punish such offences."

The laws at Harvard College in 1642 outlined regulations that concerned, "promptness, attendance at classes and prayers, dressing, idling, fishing, gaming, dancing, gambling, and searing."[4] The president and faculty, as disciplinarians, took upon themselves the responsibility to enforce the rules with the same vigor that characterized their teaching assignments. Brubacher and Rudy express no

surprise that the students came to regard faculty members as their natural enemies, and expressed their frustration in periodic riots:

> Anyone who studies the history of American undergraduate life from the first colonial colleges to the Civil War will find ample evidence to justify Hall's generalizations. This was a period when constant warfare raged between faculty and students, when college government at best was nothing but a paternal depotism, when the most outrageous pranks and disturbances were provoked by undisciplined and incredibly bold young men. It was pre-eminently a period of rowdies, riots, and rebellions." [5]

The authors continue their discussion and indicate the student response to disciplinary system:

> These outbursts could be found in all sections of the country, at state universities and denominational colleges, at "godless" Harvard and Virginia and at pious Yale and Princeton. Everywhere the atmosphere was like that of a revolutionary brawl, or a violent modern strike."[6]

Lee points out that a favorite method of punishment at Yale was "boxing" or "cuffing" the delinquent student. The students were gathered together to witness the punishment, which on one occasion turned into an embarrassing situation when the president, "swung a right and missed." Punishment was used to bring the boys to more constructive behavior, keep them at the books, mold character, and control carousing. The main purpose of the disciplinarian was to make an example of the student to such an extent that he would shrink from temptation. A main punishment was to reduce him in rank, and, if at all possible, keep him on the college rolls where he could suffer for his sins and be seen to suffer.

An example of the type of rules that were listed as temptation for the students to break is mentioned by Goldbold:

> Students were forbidden to drink, buy, or keep spirituous liquors; they were not to frequent taverns, barroms, or tippling houses. Gambling was prohibited. Fighting, strinking, and quarreling were not permitted. Students were not to accept a challenge or in any way aid, abet, or promote a duel. Cardplaying, billiards, dice, backgammon, and other games considered immoral were prohibited. Dancing and attendance at theaters, horse races, or other places of "fasionable amusement" were taboo. Late suppers and convivial reunions were frowned upon. Fornication, visiting places of ill fame, and association with persons of known bad character were forbidden. Students were not to combine for riot or disturbances, nor were they to carry or keep in their rooms firearms, gunpowder, dirks, swords, canes, or other deadly weapons. At Mercer University smoking but not chewing was prohibited. The young men were not to be guilty of "any grossly immoral conduct whatever."[7]

Rudolph[8] points out that Harvard was so successful at disciplining students that the finest rakes in England were sent to America to the "reformatory on the banks of the Charles." He states that flogging was displaced as a standard means of discipline in 1718. Boxing the student sharply on the ear took its place and continued until it was omitted from college law in 1767. Rudolph believes that this abandonment of physical punishment clearly recorded the humanitarian spirit that was loose in the Western world, and led the way to the Amercianization of the New World's univeristies.

Rudolph and Lee both cite cases of tragedy in their respective books. There was the boy who died in a duel at Dickinson, the students who were shot at Miami in Ohio, the professor who was killed at the University of Virginia, the president of Oakland College in Mississippi who was stabbed to death by a student, the president and professor who were stoned at the University of Georgia, the student who was stabbed at Illinois College, the students who were stabbed and killed at the University of Missouri and the University of North Carolina. Credit for these misfortunes was often attributed to dormitory life.

The period between 1800 and the Civil War was replte with student rebellions, including severe ones at such colleges as Virginia, Princeton, Harvard, Yale, Dartmouth, and Brown. Andrew D. White,[9] recalling his own student days at Hobart and Yale in the 1850's wrote: "I had, during my college life, known sundry college tutors seriously injured while thus doing police duty. I have seen a professor driven out of a room, through the panel of a door, with books, boots, and bootjacks hurled at his head; and even the respected president of a college, a doctor of divinity, while patrolling buildings with the janitors, subjected to outragious indignity." Dr. White expressed later that these acts of violence arose because students were not treated as responsible citizens and because members of college faculties were forced to perform the duties of policemen.

After the Civil War there were no more student rebellions. Brubacher and Rudy suggest that peace finally came to the campus when curriculum changes created a new attitude. There was also a relaxation of rigorous systems of college discipline and students began to be treated as young adults. The addition of women to many campuses added also a moderating and pacifying influence on the conduct of male students. The rise of intercollegiate athletic sports and the fraternity system tended to absorb much of the uncontrollable youthful energies, and finally, many institutions had ceased to require police duties of tutors, and began to hire men to police their grounds and building.

Following the Civil War a new freedom was created in the social life of the campus as the faculties gradually began to develop greater interest in the more impersonal world of research and scholarship and less in the regulation and supervision of student life. By 1870 Rochester, Michigan, Columbia, Cornell and Harvard were all leaders in establishing policies which gave students a wide latitude of freedom as the means toward developing character and becoming self-controlled individuals. In President Chargles Eliot's words, "It is a distinct advantage of the genuine university method that it does not pretend to maintain any parental or monastic discipline over its students, but frankly tells them that they must govern themselves. The moral purpose of a university's policy should be to train young men to self-control and self-reliance through liberty."[10]

These attitudes are somewhat different from those expressed by the early American educators. They reflect a changing philosophy that has continued to develop in higher education since the turn of the century.

Legal Authority for Code Development

The legal authority for universities to develop student conduct codes is generally authorized by state legislatures. Bakken[11] points out that this

authority may be delegated by legislative bodies to universities in at least four different ways: direct power to faculty, direct power to the board with authority to delegate it to the faculty, authority to the board with no mention of faculty, and general authority to manage the school given to the board with disciplinary authority implied. He indicates that in every type of legislation, the faculty, the administration, or both, may exercise discipline over the students under by-laws passed by governing boards. In a few cases, legislatures have passed special legislation such as the forbidding hazing.

Bakken states also that court decisions apparently give colleges and universities a great deal of latitude in code development and enforcement. Administrative officers apparently may notify parents about student behavior. Students are expected to obey the rules and regulations of the school, and may be suspended or expelled.

Bakken[12] summarized the authority of the state-supported college or university in code development. He states that the public college is an instrument of the state set up to furnish education to the state's citizens. The internal administration of the institutions is given to a governing board, administrators and faculty whose responsibility it is to operate the university in an efficient manner. These boards, administrators, and faculties have wide discretionary power in accomplishing their mission. Whatever they feel is best for the institution and students can be enacted into regulations, so long as the rules do not violate civil law. In Bakken's words: "It appears that the boards, administrative officers, and faculty will be protected by the courts in what they do as long as they act without malice or prejudice and within the framework of their respective authorities. They have wide discretion in matters affecting their institutions and students."

Current Concepts in Student Conduct Code Development

A number of studies have been conducted recently to assess the scope and effectiveness of student conduct codes. One of the most complete research reports was submitted in monograph form by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.[13]

This 1967 study surveyed approximately 457 NASPA institutions on eighteen areas of student behavior. It attempted to determine the extent to which colleges and universities have formulated institutional policies on the eighteen topics, the purposes and rationale for these policies, the methods by which the policies were formulated, the nature of their implementation, and the extent to which the eighteen issues were considered significant.

A large number of conclusions could be drawn from the findings of this study Among them are these: (1) relatively small numbers of institutions have policies in relation to deviant sexual behavior and premarital pregnancy as well as student demonstrations, student publications and drug usage. (2) such variables as dress, financial irresponsibility, off-campus misconduct, recognition of student organizations, women's hours, entertainment in residence hall bedrooms, and excessive use of alcohol are more often controlled with policies. (3) it would appear that there is a relationship between whether an instituion had a policy on a certain issue, on the one hand, and how important the institution viewed that issues, on the other. (4) on most of the issues, the content and purposes of the policies were related to the maintenance of control, order, standards and institutional image. (5) on most issues, the personnel dean or his staff played a prominent role in the processing of violations. (6) generally, when violations of the policies occurred, the penalities imposed were less severe than suspension. (7) the issues that were ranked in the upper one-third in order of importance were excessive use of alcohol, off-campus misconduct, women's hours, student dress and appearnce, and financial irresponsibility. (8) issues with low rankings were student demonstrations, controversial speakers, student records

faculty-student drinking, provision of contraceptives and use of students as research subjects.

Statement of the Problem

In today's university, the administrator is expected to deal with an ever increasing number of crises; he is often unable to benefit from the experience of other institutions. He lacks the knowledge of the practices and policies of other schools, which could likely aid him during a campus crisis. This leads to unwise and inadequate administrative responses, which contribute to misunderstanding and loss of credibility and effectiveness of institutional officials.

As an aid to solving this problem, the intent of this study was to research the following questions:

1. What are the stated values or purposes of student codes of conduct?
2. What rationale do universities use to justify their policies regarding student non-academic life?
3. How are the codes developed and revised?
4. What are the apparent trends in student code development?
5. What percent of the institutions communicate in their student handbooks policies for the variables identified below.
6. What percentage differences exist among varying university sizes and types in communicating policies in the handbooks?
7. What is the content or substantive elements of these policies?

One hundred universities were chosen randemly to be included in this study. The codes of each schools were analyzed carefully to determine answers to the questions stated above. Additionally, these one-hundred universities were divided into large state colleges and universities, small state colleges and universities, large private colleges and universities, small private colleges and universities, and religious colleges and institutions. Each of these categories were compared with each other.

Justifications for Codes

Most codes begin listing the rules and regulations by justifying the reason for sanctioning certain actions on behalf of the university. Generally these reasons fall into three categories: 1) The opportunity of all members of the university committee to attain their educational objectives 2) The generation and maintenance of an intellectual and educational atmosphere throughout the university community. 3) Protection of health, safety, welfare, property, and human rights of all members of the university community, and the safety and property of the university itself.

Trends

A study of the various codes indicate a number of trends. Even though one trend is to move away from pariental rule, especially in the larger colleges and universities, a large percentage of the codes still list considerable control over non-academic life. A Louisiana college[14] states that students may not visit off-campus apartments, or other off-campus housing for men unless properly chaperoned. Approved chaperons must be registered in the office of the Division of Student Life. Students who violate this regulation may be suspended from the roles of the college. At a Kentucky college,[15] off-campus students who are not living in their own homes or the homes of their parents must reside in homes approved by the college. Students under twenty-one years of age who desire to reside off-campus must have written parental consent to do so. Senior men and those men students over twenty-one years of age at a New York university[16] may request permission on a written form. An Ohio[17] university will not allow a student to change an off-campus residence without approval of the Dean of Men and the parent or guardian.

Another interesting example of in loco parentis is in the requirement for chaperones. A Montana college[18] serves as an example, which is prevalent in a number of colleges:

> All social events sponsored by student organizations require the presence of the group's approved adviser and one or more faculty persons, or their equivalent, as guests. The presence of these persons, acts as a leveling influence, presents opportunity for growth and social interaction by the students, and leads dignity to an event. Adviser and guests must be present from the time the activity opens until it ends. They must conduct and are required to report any violations.
>
> Chartered student organizations may secure permission from the Director of Student Activities and the Dean of Students to hold events off-campus.

Some schools may take on a parental concern regarding marriage. At one college,[19] students planning to marry during the academic year must file written notification to the Student Personnel Office thirty days in advance of the wedding. A statement from the student's parents, advising the College that the parents are aware of the planned marriage, must be filed with the notification of marriage. At an Oklahoma university a student who marries during the college year without the permission of parents and the knowledge of the Dean of Students may be asked to withdraw from the University. No academic credit will be given for work in progress at the time of withdrawal.

A second trend apparent in university codes of conduct is that students now have rights as well as responsibilities. Many codes in the past placed a great deal of emphasis on the responsibilities of students, but said very little about their rights. A major attempt to correct this concept came in the form of the "Joint Statement of Rights and Freedoms of Students,"[21] written in 1966 by some national educational organizations.

This statement of student rights and freedoms has led a number of institutions to preface their codes with a student "bill of rights." Michigan State University, the University of Iowa, and Northwestern University provide excellent examples of this approach. These statements of student rights vary both in detail and scope. But they generally cover such items as admission to the University, freedom of research, the student's right to be evaluated on knowledge and academic performance, teacher-student relationship, the right of a student to have his views and welfare considered in the formulation of university policy, students rights to assemble,

to demonstrate, to communicate, to protest, clear steps on how students will be dismissed from the university, and the student's right to be present on campus and to attend classes pending action on civil or criminal charges.

A third trend which is identified by reading present codes is for students to ask also that rules be written as explicitely as possible. In the past many rules were vague and served as catchall phrases. The "Joint Statement" provides additional endorsement of this trend:

> "The institution has an obligation to clarify those standards of behavior which it considers essential to its educational mission and its community life. . .Offenses should be as clearly defined as possible."

Despite this recommendation, a number of codes still fail to clarify regulations. The code at one college[22] states that, "Conduct befitting a gentlemen is expected at all times of students at this college. It is assumed that undergraduates will understand what constitutes gentlemenly conduct without specific regulations forbidding particular actions." At Butler University,[23] "Students are expected to maintain high standards of conduct to be eligible to remain in, and to graduate from, Butler University. It is not necessary to define such standards in detail."

Another trend is that the demand to be more explicit in stating rules, has led to a proliferation of them. In the past, there rules may have been written down only when it was convenient to enforce them. Students now have more clear impressions of the entire range of control. Some schools now have prepared their codes in such detail that they begin to read like law books. They have detailed exactly what students may do. In the past many of these rules were written as offenses occured, but now they are listed in great detail to the point of having a student know rather clearly what is expected in relation to his social and academic behavior.

A fifth trend is the demand of students that better processes be established to deal with rule violators. Many schools in the past have failed to provide a "court" system that would guarantee fair treatment to all students.

Some schools now list in great detail the process by which students may be held accountable for their actions. Especially do they outline procedures of due process that reflect the concern of the University that each student be given a fair hearing.

A final trend is the tendency to allow students participation in the code formulation as members of student, faculty, and administrative committees on student life. At most schools now, students are invited to participate in the formulation of any rule or regulation that might affect the students' academic or non-academic life.

Policies and Regulations

It is not possible to discuss in detail the study in its entirety. However, a few of the more important findings may prove useful.

Academic Irregularity

More than 79 percent of the institutions communicated policies in their handbooks concerning academic irregularity. The regulations generally followed a pattern of specifying and defining academic irregularity, which included the behavior required of students during a quiz or examination and the proper acknowledgement of sources used in term papers. Penalties imposed for violating these regulations were generally very severe; they ranged from a failing grade for a class to dismissal or suspension. Occasionally the penalty would make a student ineligible for membership in a campus organization or prohibit him from holding a student government office. Scholarships and financial aids also could be withheld. Student personnel officers were generally responsible for administering the penalties, although the faculty also played important roles in the enforcement of this policy.

Use and Possession of Alcoholic Beverages

Ninety-four percent of the institutions communicated policies in their handbooks regarding the use and possession of alcoholic beverages. The majority of the schools (64 percent) did not permit alcohol on campus, while 30 percen allowed some use under controlled approval and supervision.

Universities used a wide variety of written rules to prohibit or allow the use of alcohol on campus. Generally the rules included rationale, quotes from state laws, penalties for violations, specific guidelines for campus use, complete restriction, or limited use in the dorms an[illegible] special campus functions. Even those institutions that allowed some use of alcohol on campus did so under rather detailed regulations. The trend was to allow drinking in the dorms and married student housing and other regulated social events, but to prohibit alcoholic use at such functions as athletic contests, graduation exercises, academic instruction sessions or lectures.

The regulations varied in detail from a simple statement prohibiting the use of alcohol on campus to very detailed procedures. Usually the rules would include penalties for violating the regulations. These penalties were generally not too severe and quite often took the form of a warning or probation. Suspension from the university was reserved for only the most serious cases. The student personnel staff was usually responsible for the enforcement of the policy.

Drugs

Most of the institutions had policies prohibiting the illegal use of drugs. All of the large state schools listed regulations, as did the majority of large private and religious colleges and universities. Very little percentage difference existed between the varying types and sizes of schools.

The stated policies on drugs generated the most restrictive rules of all the variables reviewed for this study. They also specified the most severe penalties for violating the policy, which almost always included suspension from the institution. A few policies included educational statements that attempted to inform the student concerning the dangerous nature of drug use. Many of them made some reference to state or federal laws including the fines and prison penalties that could be imposed.

A number of schools indicated a desire to handle this problem internally, but would not protect drug users from arrest or conviction by civil authorities. Most institutions urged all students to consider very seriously the personal and institutional risks surrounding drug use, and encouraged educational programs to make students aware of the dangers associated with this behavior. Penalties were generally handled by the student personnel staff, which would usually process violations which occurred on or off campus, even after civil authorities had taken action.

Hazing

Only 30 percent of the institutions listed policies in their handbooks prohibiting hazing. Many schools listing policies did so in rather simple terms, making clear to the students disapproval of any behavior that would tend to degrade or endanger the life or health of another individual. Penalties affixed for violating the regulation on hazing often included social probation, disciplinary suspension or some prosecution by state authorities if the incident merited it. Quite often the rule would outline penalties for organizations as well as individuals that promote hazing. Student personnel deans were generally assigned to administer the policy, but lower agencies, such as an interfraternity council, might be used to hear violations and impose penalties.

Women's Hours

Only 25 percent of the institutions listed formalized policies requiring all women to maintain hours. The other schools allowed some or all of their women students to have unrestricted hours. The most restrictive colleges are the private ones with less than 5,000 students. Small state institutions and religious schools restrict all students 35 percent and 25 percent of the time respectively. None of the large state schools required all women to maintain hours and only 5 percent of the large private ones did so.

The specific hours imposed vary greatly and seem dependent on the type and size of the institution. Those schools requiring all women to meet a curfew usually allowed junior and senior women more freedom. Schools that required only some of their women to maintain curfew usually restricted the regulations to freshmen and sometimes for only the first quarter in school. A few institutions provided a choice of dormitories, some with hours and some without, depending upon the desires of the occupants. Penalties for violating curfew regulations were generally not severe. They were usually imposed by dorm judiciaries and often included restricting the student to her room for a specified period of time.

Room Inspection and Entrance

Less than half of the institutions stated policies outlining procedures used to enter and inspect student living quarters. Even though most schools implied this right, only 38 percent of them informed the students in handbooks of the specific processes used for inspection.

Most of the universities that listed policies in this area did so in some detail, including the steps required to obtain authorization for the search. The rights of the students when an inspection was made were often outlined. Some institutions, however, simply stated in their policy that the university reserved the right to inspect rooms when university property or environmental health and

safety matters were concerned. The personnel dean's staff was usually responsible for authorizing a search or inspection. Policies did not generally indicate any penalties, except to refer to other regulations that prohibit the type of behavior that a search attempts to uncover.

Room Visitation

Forty-six percent of the institutions stated policies in their handbooks allowing for the entertainment of members of the opposite sex in residence hall bedrooms. Large state schools were the most permissive with 60 percent providing this opportunity.

Even though nearly half of the institutions allow visitation, there is still considerable control over this type of activity. The university maintains strong influence in developing these policies, even though students do have considerable voice in establishing guidelines. Penalties generally did not include suspension unless the students were found guilty of violating other policies of a more serious nature. The violators were handled by dorm judiciaries, for the majority of cases, with only the very serious offenses being referred to the personnel dean.

Theft

Although it could be assumed that all institutions prohibit the theft of university and individual property, only 57 percent of the schools communicated this policy in their handbooks. Most generally policies prohibiting theft were simple and direct. They included the protection against theft of all university and individual property. Occasionally the policy included the misuse of funds, bad checks, telephone calls and forgery. Penalties were most often handled by the personnel dean and were not referred to civil authorities unless the problem was deemed very serious. A number of the large schools, however, refe d all theft problems directly to civil authorities, and only involved the university in additional penalties if the personnel dean considered it advisable. Severe

punitive actions, such as suspension, was usually reserved only for the most serious problems.

Confidentiality of Student Records

Seventy-one percent of the institutions did not communicate in their handbooks policies pertaining to the confidentiality of student records. Even though the percentage of schools stating written policies was small, these institutions developed the regulations in some detail. They often included the procedures to be used in distributing various types of records, such as personnel records, academic records, and discipline records. The universities emphasized student rights in regard to outside agencies and individuals having access to the records. There was rarely any penalty affixed to this policy, since any violation usually involves an administrator. A number of schools, however, established committees to review any complaints. None of the policies reviewed contained specific punitive measures to be enforced in the event that policies were not followed.

Compulsory Class Attendance

Sixty-eight percent of the institutions included policies in their handbooks concerning class attendance. Mandatory class attendance was required by 34 percent of the schools. Only 3 percent had policies allowing for class "cuts," while 25 percent allowed the professor to set class attendance standards. Thirty-eight percent of the handbooks did not require mandatory class attendance or did not make any statement at all.

Policy statements in the handbooks ranged from rather strict requirements concerning attendance to policies that prohibited a professor to use attendance as a criteria for grading. The policies generally included a variety of plans to include everything from required attendance for all students to mandatory attendance for only freshmen. Some schools listed the exact number of days that

could be missed without penalty. Violations were usually handled by the professor, but could be referred to the personnel dean if the teacher deemed it necessary. The penalty was usually not very severe and often included only a reduction in grade, or in some cases a failing grade. Only extreme cases demanded suspension or dismissal from the university.

Student Demonstrations

A rather large number of institutions (54 percent) did not communicate in their handbooks policies regarding student participation in political and social issues and guaranteeing the rights of free speech, petition and assembly. Large state schools with more than 10,000 students were more inclined to do so, while the small private colleges indicated the least interest.

The general tendency regarding this variable was for a school to make a short statement on the rights of free speech, petition and assembly and then develop in detail a list of rules disallowing disruptive activities. Those schools that stated specific policies usually developed a means by which the student group could register the demonstration. The registration quite often included the date, time, location, and purpose of the demonstration. A guarantee was almost always required that the event would not interfer with the orderly functioning of the university. The personnel dean was most often the responsible person to clear this activity and to work with violators. Penalties for violating regulations on demonstrations varied according to campus and generally included a request to cease and desist from the activity. If action was required, each case was considered individuallyand appropriate action taken, to include suspension and civil prosecution in severe cases.

Disruptive Activities

Nearly all of the institutions had policies prohibiting the disruption of the peaceful and orderly functioning of the university. Seventy-seven percent listed

this specific policy in their handbooks. All of the large state universities outlined policies as did 90 percent of the large private ones. The colleges to show the least interest were the small private ones.

No other variable reviewed for this study generated more detailed regulations. This was particularly true of the larger universities that went into considerable detail outlining which behaviors were not acceptable, including the imposed penalties. These policies included a statement of philosophy in addition to rules restricting persons who may enter the campus, occupy university buildings during closed hours, obstruct entrances, picket, parade and demonstrate. Some schools used existing state laws to prohibit disruption, while others simply stated in a sentence or two that disruptive activities would not be tolerated. Most institutions, however, prohibited such activity in explicit and detailed terms.

Generally violators were handled by established university committees under the direction of the personnel dean. This was the only variable that caused some schools to establish special committees to hear issues of conscience and to deal with faculty members who might participate in disruptive activity. Penalties were affixed according to each individual case and could include dismissal from the university and prosecution by civil authorities.

Off-Campus Speakers

Only 41 percent of the institutions had a policy in their handbook outlining procedures for inviting speakers to campus, even though it could be assumed that a larger number than this have formulated policies in this area. The large state and private schools formulated regulations most often, and the small private and state colleges did so the least often.

A large variety of regulations existed among the institutions. Generally these rules were not intended to restrict speakers from appearing on the basis of their controversiality, but rather to insure that recognized groups were extending the invitation according to proper procedures. Often a committee of students

and faculty would be assigned the task of clearning speakers. This was a procedure employed by a large number of the small institutions. Sometimes the adviser to a group had the authority to invite a speaker. Many regulations included also rules that the speaker must follow during his talk, including the allowance for students to ask questions. Occasionally the policy would include a provision to invite speakers to campus with an opposite view.

Most policies did not include statements outlining penalties for violating regulations. Those that did generally stated that complaints of abuse would be referred to a regularly constituted review board and would be considered on an individual basis. No policy mentioned suspension as a possible penalty.

Unacceptable Off-Campus Behavior

Even though most schools still take an interest in the off-campus behavior of students, only 55 percent of the institutions communicated this concern in specific terms in their handbooks. The religious colleges indicated the most interest with 75 percent of them stating that off-campus misbehavior would be reviewed.

Institutions that accepted responsibility for off-campus behavior usually did so with a general statement indicating that disciplinary action would be taken when the welfare of the institution was threatened or when requested by civil authorities. Some schools simply stated that a student who violated civil laws was not automatically subject to penalties of the university, but he might be if the action against the student was found to be a detriment to the university community or constituted a danger to himself or others on campus. This broad statement, of course, allows schools a great deal of freedom in this area of student behavior. If a school did take action, the penalty for an off-campus violation would probably be the same as one committed on campus.

Student Rights in Procedural Due Process

Seventy-one percent of the institutions included statements in their handbooks outlining student rights in procedural due process. All of the large state schools listed these rights and 90 percent of the large private universities did also. The religious and small state and private institutions were less likely to do so.

Most policies outlining student rights in procedural due process included a guarantee for a student to be informed of the nature of the charges against him, to have a fair opportunity to rebuke them, to appeal the decision, to not be required to testify against himself, and to choose someone to represent him in the case. These policies were incorporated into the disciplinary system to provide the student with a guarantee of fairness, a right that he has not always had. Because of the nature of this variable, no penalties were outlined for those who may not abide by the policy.

Procedural Due Process

Nearly all of the institutions (84 percent) had policies outlining the practices and procedures used to process student misconduct problems. All of the large state schools and 90 percent of the small state colleges and large private institutions outlined their procedures in the handbooks.

Most codes outline in detail the procedures used to process student misbehavior. This usually included a description of the various judicial bodies, such as dormitory judiciaries, fraternity and sorority hearing boards and an all-university standards committee. Although the schools varied a great deal in the way these bodies were organized, most of them were designed to accomplsih the same function. In most cases the committees were composed of both students and faculty. Each code detailed the procedures to be followed before, during and

following a hearing. This included special features such as prosecutors, the right of appeal, allowing a student to choose which type of body should hear his case, and the penalties that could be affixed.

Deviant Sexual Behavior

Although it is assumed that the majority of institutions have policies prohibiting deviant sexual behavior, only 26 percent of them communicated these policies in their handbooks. Most of the categories were evenly matched with the privateschools the least likely to do so.

It is interesting to note that of all the variables reviewed for this study, this one generated the smallest percent of written regulations. In most cases the policy was stated in very simple language such as a prohibition to engage in illicit sexual relations or perversions. Most statements were one sentence in length and did not elaborate or define the exact nature of the prohibited behavior. Although the students were warned in a number of cases that disciplinary action would be taken, usually the severity of this action was not specified. The impression given was that sexual problems would more likely be referred to the counseling staff rather than dismissed from school, unless the counseling approach could not improve the student's behavior.

Dress

Forty-six percent of the institutions had prescribed dress codes for at least some occasions. The most restrictive schools were the religious ones and small state ones. The least restrictive were the large state and private universities. In all comparisons, the large institutions, whether state, private, or religious, had the least interest in dress regulations.

A number of schools designated as not having some regulations did express a desire for students to dress appropriately, but no specific guidelines were

established and no penalties were affixed. Those that did maintain regulations prescribed them most generally for the living and eating units and the classroom. The policies on dress were usually developed by student committees and were designed to create a desirable campus atmosphere. Violations of dress standards were usually handled by minor judiciaries and penalties were in the lower ranges of severity and did not include dismissal.

Recognition of Student Organizations

Seventy-two percent of the institutions had policies regarding student organizations, and most of these required some form of official approval of all student organizations. The religious schools (85 percent) were the most likely to require recognition.

Most policies required the organization to have a faculty adviser and to provide a list of officers and a constitution. Very few schools requested a list of members. In some cases the student government had the sole responsibility to recognize groups, and in almost all cases it had partial authority. Generally, however, a recommendation for approval moved from the student government to the personnel dean and then to the president. Occasionally a faculty body would give its approval. Another method that appears to be gaining in importance is the establishment of a student-faculty committee on student affairs, which is often given the responsibility to approve campus organizations. Policy violations seemed to be of little concern, with the most popular penalty including some type of sanction or denial of a privilege accorded to recognized organizations.

1. The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. III, No. 22, September 15, 1969.

2. John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, Higher Education in Transition (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958), p. 51.

3. W. Storrs Lee, God Bless Our Queer old Dean (New York: G. P. Putman's Son, 1959), p. 35.

4. John D. Millett, The Academic Community (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1962), p. 5.

5. John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, Higher Education in Transition (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1958), p. 51.

6. Ibid., p. 53.

7. Albea Goldbold, The Church College of the Old South, pp. 188-189.

8. Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University (New York: Alfred A. Knoph Company, 1962), p. 27.

9. Brubacher and Rudy, Higher Education in Transition, p. 54.

10. Eugen Kuehnemann, Charles W. Eliot (New York, 1909), p. 51.

11. Clarence J. Bakken, The Legal Basis for College Student Personnel Work, Student Personnel Series No. 2 (Washington, D. C.: American College Personnel Association, 1961), p. 44.

12. Bakken, The Legal Basis for College Student Personnel Work, p. 56.

13. T. B. Dutton, J. R. Appleton, and F. W. Smith, "Institutional Policies on Controversial Topics," The Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, Monograph No. 1 (January, 1968).

14. Southeastern Louisiana College, Hammond, Louisiana, The Student Handbook, 1969, and Living Standards for Women Students, 1969, p. 30.

15. Kentucky State College, Frankfort, Kentucky, The K-Book, 1968, and Supplement, 1969, p. 26.

16. Niagra University, Niagra, New York, Information Handbook for Undergraduate Students, 1969-70, p. 24.

17. Central State University, Wilberforce, Ohio, Student Handbook, 1969, p. 35.

18. Eastern Montana College, Billings, Montana, Student Handbook, 1969-70, p. 19.

19. Wheaton College, Wheaton, Illinois, Student Handbook, 1969-70, p. 31.

20. Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee, Oklahoma, The Green Book, 1969-70, p. 41.

21. Joint Statement on Rights and Freedoms of Students, under the auspices of the American Association of University Professors (Washington, D. C.: American College Personnel Association, 1961).

22. Amherst College, Amherst, Massachusetts, Student Handbook, 1969-70, p. 14.

23. Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana, Student Handbook, 1969-70, p. 5.